

| | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FILED ENTERED | <input type="checkbox"/> RECEIVED SERVED ON COUNSEL/PARTIES OF RECORD |
| <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px auto; width: 150px;">MAR 25 2010</div> | |
| CLERK US DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA | |
| BY: _____ | DEPUTY _____ |

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

HARALD RICHTER,

Plaintiff,

v.

SUPA TECHNOLOGY, CO., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:08-cv-00005-LDG (GWF)

VERDICT

1. Does the Supa Technology GO 5 mount infringe United States Patent No. 6,749,160?

☒
Yes

☐
No

2. Does the Supa Technology GO 5 mount infringe United States Patent No. 7,178,771?

☒
Yes

☐
No

3. Does the Supa Technology GO 6 mount infringe United States Patent No. 6,749,160?

☒
Yes

☐
No

1 4. Does the Supa Technology GO 700 mount infringe United States Patent No.
2 7,178,771?

3 ☒ ☐
4 Yes No

5 5. Does the Supa Technology GO 800 mount infringe United States Patent No.
6 7,178,771?

7 ☒ ☐
8 Yes No

9
10 **PATENT VALIDITY**

11 6. Is United States Patent No. 6,749,160 valid?

12 ☒ ☐
13 Yes No

14 7. Is United States Patent No. 7,178,771 valid?

15 ☒ ☐
16 Yes No

17
18 If you have found that Defendant Supa Technology has infringed one or both of the
19 patents-in-suit (a "yes" answer to questions 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5), and you have found that the
20 patent or patents infringed upon by Supa Technology is valid (questions 6 or 7), then
21 please answer the remaining questions.

22
23 **DAMAGES**

24 8. What were the total number of units of GO 5 sold by Supa Technology after it
25 received notice of United States Patent No. 6,749,160? 49,123
26

- 1 9. What were the total number of units of GO 5 sold by Supa Technology after it
2 received notice of United States Patent No. 7,178,771? 49,123
3
4 10. What were the total number of units of GO 700 and GO 800 sold by Supa
5 Technology after it received notice of United States Patent
6 No. 7,178,771? 100,930
7
8 11. What was the reasonable royalty rate for the patents-in-suit as of the first
9 date infringement began? \$ 2.08
10

11 **WILLFULNESS OF INFRINGEMENT**

- 12 12. Was the infringement by Supa Technology a willful infringement?

13 ✓
14 Yes

No

15 DATED this 25 day of MARCH, 2010.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

151
Foreperson